

applicant respectfully asserts that these claims are now clear and requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless—

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-5, 7 and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Best. Best shows a coin acceptance apparatus with two acceptance bands K and K', which acceptance band a coin falls in will determine which band is used for the next coin.

Claim 1 has been amended and now recites that the method includes subsequently determining whether the measured properties meet at least one further set of criteria --of an article of a different type--. Thus, it is now clear that claim 1 is directed to a method for performing a regular validation operation and issuing a signal indicating whether a deposited article is a valid article of one of a predetermined number of types, and then subsequently carrying out a further validation operation to determine whether the article is of a different type. Thus, for example, if there was only enough time to determine whether the currency article is one of n denominations before having to issue an accept or reject signal, it is still possible to check whether the deposited article corresponds to a further x predetermined denominations (or counterfeits). If it does, the information may be used to influence the subsequent behavior of the mechanism.

In contrast, Best teaches a method for validating coins that changes the acceptance band for a particular type of coin based on the measured signal of a valid coin

of that type. Best teaches to switch acceptance bands to prevent further attempts to defraud the machine with that type of coin (see col. 2, lines 62-67 of the '989 patent). Thus, Best does not teach to apply the same measured properties of an item that has already been through the validation process to criteria of an article of a different type. Consequently, claim 1 is not anticipated, and neither are dependent claims 2-5, 7, 10 and 11.

Claim 12 pertains to a method of validating different types of articles of currency, wherein a sequence of determinations is made regarding whether the article is a valid one of the types. The sequence is then subsequently altered. Such operation may be especially beneficial in the case where a genuine article of type x is rejected because the currency validator did not have enough time to check the measured properties against each of the plurality of sets of criteria, one of which was that of type x. Thus, the sequence is altered and if the consumer repeatedly re-inserts article x, then eventually acceptance will result. The goal of claim 12 is to overcome the problem of having a limited time to perform validation before having to issue an accept or a reject signal. Such operation is not taught or suggested by Best, and thus, claim 12 and dependent claim 13 are not anticipated.

Claims 14-17 pertain to changing the set of denominations which is considered prior to issuing the accept/reject signal. In different validation operations, the measured properties of a currency article can be compared with different target denominations, so that if an article is inserted and then rejected, because it does not match one of the target denominations, then re-insertion might produce acceptance, because the set of target denominations is changed. In particular, during the subsequent validation operations,

claim 14 recites that one of the sets of criteria is not considered during the validation period, and claim 15 recites that a different set of criteria is automatically used during the validation period. Similarly, apparatus claims 16 and 17 recite that, during subsequent validation operations, the apparatus automatically prevents one of the sets of criteria from being effective and the apparatus automatically enables a set of criteria to be effective, respectively. Such operation is absent from the disclosure of Best, and thus claims 14-17 are not anticipated thereby.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections.

4. Claims 1-5 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Dobbins et al. Notice col. 13, lines 15-54 which disclose that subsequent to issuing a valid coin signal the measured properties M are compared to a deviation limit DEV and an adjustment to the coin acceptance window can result.

The Dobbins et al. deviation limit technique pertains to subsequently modifying an acceptance criteria of an article type based on the measurement result of an article of that type. In contrast, claim 1 teaches to apply further criteria to the current measured properties, and the further criteria relate to different article types. Further, independent claim 12 recites to subsequently alter the sequence of determinations independent of whether the article is valid or invalid. Consequently, claims 1-5 and 9-13 are not anticipated, and the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection.

5. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Wayne et al. Notice that in the teach mode an inserted coin

changes the coin acceptance window between a narrow and wide range for subsequent coins.

Waine et al. teaches a money validator having manually operable switches to enable to validator to be switched between a testing mode and a teach mode (see col. 1, line 59 to col. 2, line 5 of the '149 patent). The goal of Waine et al. is to provide an easy technique for enabling and disabling money validation ranges so that relatively inexperienced personnel, or vending machine owners, could adjust the ranges when appropriate (see col. 3, lines 12-32).

In contrast, as explained above, claims 12-17 concern automatically altering the sequence of determinations as to validity, either after a validation determination (claim 12) or prior to issuing an accept or reject signal (claims 14-17). Consequently, claims 12-17 are not anticipated by Waine et al. and the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 6 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The applicant notes that claims 6 and 8 would be allowable if re-written, but declines to so amend in view of the above amendments and remarks.

Drawings

7. The drawings are objected to because the boxes in Figs. 3, 5, 7 and 8 used to show conventional features are not labeled. Correction is required.

Enclosed herewith for the Examiner's approval are copies of Figs. 3, 5, 7 and 8 amended to include labels. A second set of figures marked in red ink to show the changes is also included. In view of these changes, withdrawal of the objection to the figures is respectfully requested.

New claims 18 and 19 have been added, and find support, for example, on page 6, line 11 to page 7, line 12 of the application. No new matter has been added. The applicant respectfully asserts that claims 18 and 19 are allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claims 13-17.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

Please apply any credits or excess charges to our deposit account no. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6 JULY 2000


Stephan J. Filipek
Reg. No. 33,384

Fish & Richardson P.C.
45 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 2800
New York, NY 10111
(212) 765-5070 telephone
(212) 258-2291 facsimile
www.fr.com web site

30013084.doc